

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
ALEXANDRIA DIVISION**

ROSY GIRON DE REYES, *et al.*,

Plaintiff,

v.

WAPLES MOBILE HOME PARK
LIMITED PARTNERSHIP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil No.: 1:16cv563-TSE-TCB

PROPOSED ORDER

UPON CONSIDERATION of Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 128), Defendants Waples Mobile Home Park Limited Partnership, Waples Project Limited Partnership, and A. J. Dwoskin & Associates, Inc.’s (collectively “Defendants”) Non-confidential Memorandum in Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Seal and Local Civil Rule 5, it is hereby

ORDERED that Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 128) is GRANTED in PART.

Before this Court may seal documents, it must: “(1) provide public notice of the request to seal and allow interested parties a reasonable opportunity to object, (2) consider less drastic alternatives to sealing the documents, and (3) provide specific reasons and factual findings supporting its decision to seal the documents and for rejecting the alternatives.” *Ashcraft v. Conoco, Inc.*, 218 F.3d 282, 288 (4th Cir. 2000) (internal citations omitted). In compliance with Local Rule 5 and *Ashcraft*, Plaintiffs filed a public Notice of Filing of Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 101) and the Court has posted this notice on the Court’s public

docket. A brief description of the content (“Proposed Sealed Documents”) that Plaintiffs move to seal (Dkt. 128) and in support of which Defendants have filed their non-confidential memorandum is as follows:

- A confidential and internal audit spreadsheet (Ex. 7 to Dkt. 127)
- A confidential screening services activation agreement between Defendants and Yardi (Ex. 10 to Dkt. 127);
- A portion of Plaintiffs’ Reply in support of Plaintiffs’ Objection to the Magistrate Judge’s Order Denying Plaintiffs’ Motion to Compel (Dkt. 127) which refers to the exhibits cited above.

UPON CONSIDERATION of Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 128), Defendants’ Non-confidential Memorandum in Response to Plaintiffs’ Motion to Seal and Local Civil Rule 5, and having seen no opposition filed to Plaintiffs’ Motion to File Documents Under Seal (Dkt. 128), the Court hereby

FINDS that less drastic alternatives to sealing the Proposed Sealed Documents are not feasible. Further, it is hereby

ORDERED that the Proposed Sealed Documents shall be maintained under seal by the Clerk, until otherwise directed.

ENTERED this ____ day of December 2016.

U.S. District Court for the
Eastern District of Virginia